

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RICHARD ANTONIO TEJEDA,

Defendant and Appellant.

E056446

(Super.Ct.No. BAF1200260)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Edward Forstenzer, Judge. (Retired judge of the Mono Super. Ct. assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to art. VI, § 6 of the Cal. Const.) Affirmed.

Stephen M. Hinkle, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant Richard Tejeda is serving four years in prison after pleading guilty to inflicting corporal injury on a spouse. (Pen. Code, § 273.5, subd. (a).) As discussed below, we affirm the judgment of conviction and the sentence.

PROCEDURE¹

On April 25, 2012, the People filed a felony complaint charging that, on or about April 21, 2012, defendant inflicted a corporal injury on his spouse, Lynda T. The People further alleged that defendant had two prison term priors under Penal Code section 667.5, subdivision (b).

On May 4, 2012, defendant pled guilty to the charges. On that same day, the trial court imposed the agreed-upon sentence of two years (the low term) in state prison plus one year for each of the prison term priors, for a total prison term of four years. This appeal followed.

DISCUSSION

Upon defendant's request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 [87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493], setting forth a statement of the case and a summary of the facts and requesting this court to conduct an independent review of the record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but he has not done so. Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have independently reviewed the record for potential error and find no arguable issues.

DISPOSITION

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

¹ Because defendant pled guilty before the preliminary hearing, the record does not contain the facts of the crime, other than that it involved corporal injury to a spouse.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ

P. J.

We concur:

HOLLENHORST

J.

MILLER

J.